

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/921,936 | RAO ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | OLEG SURVILLO | 2442 | |

All Participants:

Status of Application: allowed

(1) Oleg Survillo, Examiner AU 2442.

(3) _____.

(2) Myunggon Hong, Reg. No.: 65,034.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 May 2010

Time: 1:00pm EST

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

1, 33

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Philip C Lee/

Acting Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2442

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Called applicant's attorney to discuss proposed claim amendments that would place the application in condition for allowance. It was agreed on that the proposed claim amendments would be communicated to the attorney for review and approval. In a subsequent interview on May 21, 2010 proposed "adapted to" language was discussed with respect to claim 1 and proposed "non-transitory" language with respect to claim 33. As to claim 1, examiner indicated that "adapted to" language is not acceptable because according to MPEP section 2111.04 claim scope is not limited by claim language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed. It was agreed on that "adapted to" language will be removed and claim steps will be positively recited in the allowed version of claim 1. As to claim 33, examiner indicated that addition of "non-transitory" in the "machine-readable medium" claims is necessary to limit the claim to cover only statutory embodiments such as those directed to non-transitory tangible media. Examiner verified that addition of "non-transitory" as proposed, only excludes transitory propagating signals per se in view of the ordinary and customary meaning of machine-readable media. As a result of the interview, an authorization from the applicant's attorney was granted for this examiner's amendment.